

REMARKS

Claims 2-6 and 28 are pending for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claim 2 has been amended to more particularly point out that the claimed test contactor is *for mounting on* a test Printed Circuit Board. Claim 3 has been amended to show that it properly depends from claim 2. Claim 6, which was inadvertently withdrawn in the Response to Office Action dated April 26, 2005 (responding to the Office action mailed January 26, 2005), has been restored and has been amended. Claim 6 should not have been withdrawn because, as argued in the April 26, 2005, Response at page 7, the insertion restraint 211 to which it is directed is shown in Fig. 2, the Figure of the elected species. Claim 28 has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,782,289 to Schwar et al. (Schwar).

Claim 2 recites in pertinent part:

a conductive probe having . . . a locking projection projected between the tip and the bottom in a radial outward direction

Schwar neither discloses nor suggests a conductive probe having a locking projection *projected in a radial outward direction*. Rather, Schwar discloses a *reduced-diameter* portion of shaft 34 that cooperates with annular stop 36 of the internal casing 31 to limit travel of the shaft. See Schwar, 3:58-64 and Fig. 3. In fact, by teaching a structure having a reduced-diameter portion, rather than an outward-projected (*i.e.*, increased-diameter) portion, Schwar teaches away from claim 2.

Accordingly, Schwar fails to disclose each and every element of claim 2. Thus, the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn. As claims 3-5 depend from claim 2, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn, for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

It is believed claims 2-6 and 28 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner not agree with any of Applicant's positions or arguments herein, a telephonic or personal interview is respectfully requested to discuss and resolve any remaining issues.

No fee other than the \$225 for the extension of time is believed due for this submission. However, please charge the extension fee and any other fee that may be due to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-1013.

Date: December 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



By Lawrence R. Gabuzda (Reg. No. 51,711)

For Brian M. Rothery (Reg. No. 35,340)

JONES DAY

222 East 41st Street

New York, New York 10017

(212) 326-3939